Assignment 5

Aim: To evaluate an interface using usability evaluation technique.

Content:
For the purpose of this assignment we will be using the Neielsen's evaluation technique to evaluate the interface we have developed.

1. Visibility of system status: In our interface the user gets a visible realistic timeline of the expected application deadline, exam schedule, results dates and the evaluation schedule.

2. Match between the system and the real world: Unlike the website interface our application simulates the journey of the student throughout the university by providing the student notifications and information relevant to him at that particular stage.

3. User control and freedom: Our application returns the control to the hands of the student giving him the freedom to have a smooth experience interacting with the application unlike the overwhelming website.

4. Consistency and standards: Unlike the website that follows different templates for different parts our application has a consistent design and interface, this not only boosts confidence in our application but also reduces ambiguity for the student. We have developed this application keeping in mind all the UI-UX standards.

5. Error prevention: Our application provides clear information to the students at the time of taking any input from the students, this

reduces errors on the part of the user and prevents rework. Also the application has been designed in such a way so as to handle all possible states and workflows.

6. Recognition rather than recall: Unlike the website our application is very less intensive of the users memory but provides a visual edge to remember and recall. This in turn helps the user by not straining their memory and provides a pleasant interaction with the application.

7. Flexibility and efficiency of use: With a minimal number of clicks unlike the website the student can go from one part of the website to another very smoothly. This makes our application more flexible and efficient for the use of the student users.

8. Aesthetic and minimalist design: With consistent fonts, colour palette, colour depth, resolution, layout and orientation the interface of our application does not strain the senses of the user.

9. Help users recognise, diagnose and recover from errors: First of all our application does not let its users make any errors by providing a very simple interface, secondly if the user if the user does make any error, the application tells the user about the same through meaningful error messages and recommends a course of recovery.

10. Help and documentation: Primarily our application does not require any help or documentation, but still we maintain a compilation of FAQs and their respective suggestions.

Cognitive Walkthrough :

The task for the cognitive walkthrough is to register on the application and check whether the results have been declared. If the results are declared, it has to check what the results are.

The assessor judge the performance of the user based on the following criteria:

- Will the user try and achieve the right outcome?
    - Yes, the user will achieve the right outcome.

- Will the user notice that the correct action is available to them?
    - Yes, the user is able to easily determine the correct course of action.

- Will the user associate the correct action with the outcome they expect to achieve?
    - Yes, the user is able to successfully correlate the intended action with the purpose of each button.

- If the correct action is performed will the user see that progress is being made towards their intended outcome?
    - Yes, the user will get an intuitive idea that he/she is making progress towards their intended outcome.

- Does the user at any point of time feel the urge to quit/exit/ask for any help?
    - 10/10 users do not feel the need for any help.
    - 9/10 users do not feel the urge to quit.